



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ATHLETICS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE NATION

By WILLIAM H. P. FAUNCE*

President of Brown University

THE great war, which has turned its powerful searchlight upon all the institutions and ideals of our civilization, is revealing to us the real meaning of our games as well as our tasks. In the lurid light of burning cities some things come startlingly clear. Under the stress of the urgent mobilization of all the powers and resources of the people we are asking of every institution and every method: "Can it, does it, serve the nation?" The searchlight is turned on every practice of the past, and in its pitiless beam our luxuries and vanities and pretenses shrivel and turn to ashes, but the real factors of national well-being stand revealed as essential and commanding. Unless college sports can demonstrate today that they are more than trifles, more than costly advertisement, more than a pedestal for individual notoriety; unless they can be shown to make better citizens, and so better soldiers; unless they can produce men capable of democratic, whole-souled co-operation in devotion to the ideals of the nation, they will be sent to the scrap-heap by an indignant people.

Do they produce men resourceful and self-reliant, courageous yet restrained, virile yet courteous, aggressive yet patient—do they make a man the captain of his soul? We know the answer of the English people—a people that think and speak on the gravest problems of life in terms of outdoor games. To the Englishman the supreme virtue is fair play. To him the ideal hero is not the warrior or the saint, but the man who "plays the game." To him the vocabulary of sport has become the terminology of ethics. Duty is conceived in terms of the cricket match and the boat race, and even if oblivious to the virtues of St. Francis and the symbolism of the crucifix, he is keenly sensitive to the virtues of Sir Galahad and Sir Philip Sidney.

The German has a wholly different conception of life. To him life is essentially discipline imposed by authority. Hence, exercise takes the form of painstaking drill under a commanding officer. The Frenchman and the Italian conceive life under still other categories in which the artistic ideal predominates, and action must be beautiful in order to be interesting.

We in America have inherited the English ideal, but we have carried it farther than England ever dreamed of. Our alert, nervous American temperament, kept at constant tension by a bracing atmosphere and constant changes of temperature, has plunged into athletic competitions with a keenness, a recklessness, a determination to win which has brought us often into social and moral disaster. It is folly to go to a red-blooded young man and beg him to take less interest in his game. All his nature rebels against a milk-and-water attitude or an assumption of indifference to what he is doing. He is honestly enthusiastic, and he ought to be. He flings his total self into the contest, and he ought to. With

fine abandon he plunges into the game and struggles "till the last white line is crossed." And any pedagogue who imagines that if we could destroy that enthusiasm we should thereby promote interest in philosophy and art is quite ignorant both of the ancient Greeks and of modern Americans.

But can we not show the eager athletic student that the abiding satisfaction of life is in doing a fine piece of work—whether in the laboratory or on the gridiron? Can we not persuade him that skill and strategy and dauntless courage are fine things to witness or to share, whatever the final score may be? Every true artist finds more joy in painting the picture than in getting its value in dollars and cents. Every carpenter has honest pride of craftsmanship, every real engineer takes satisfaction in the building of the bridge, as well as in the commission he receives. Every honorable surgeon finds his joy in the operation more than in the fee. Indeed, here is the touchstone of effort.

We can also at this time take a lesson from the war camps both in America and in Europe. They have had to devise at short notice an effective system for the education of millions of young men. They have found outdoor games essential to the morale of the troops. The physical benefit is obvious, since military drill is not conducive to the highest physical development. It may cramp some muscles and leave others quite unused. Military drill achieves its best result when it comes as a finishing process after the general development given by gymnasium and playground.

But the chief reason why the soldiers need organized play is that it furnishes diversion—release from tension of spirit, from long hours of monotonous toil. And this is precisely the reason why our colleges need it in wartime. If our students are encouraged merely to sit in their rooms and mope, to lament for absent friends and question their own motives and their own fate, the spirit of the American college is weakened and its service to the nation impeded. The same hearty, wholesome games that have proved essential at the front are essential behind the front today. We have all read of the British company that went "over the top" kicking a football before them. That may not be in good form, and the story may not be true. But it is certain that kicking the football before going over the top is one of the best possible preparations for meeting either victory or defeat with a steady heart.

But if we take a lesson from the camps we shall provide for a far more general participation in games by college students. The army has no interest in developing a few Samsons or Sandows. It is interested in a campaign to develop every man in the line. In military instruction the greatest efforts are lavished on the soldier who knows the least. He is put into the awkward squad, and has private lessons. The college should see that some form of supervised athletic sport is required of every student, and that special attention is given, not to the "stars," but to the "duffers." A real physical director is interested chiefly in the men of poor physique—it is for their sake that he is employed. A real coach in baseball or football would be interested chiefly in the students who do not know how to play. It is chiefly for their sakes that we want the game. A

* From an address at the annual meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, New York City, December 28, 1917.

supervisor of athletics at one N. E. College was recently explaining the situation of his college in basketball. He said: "I tell our 'Varsity Five that I like to see them play, but that my real interest is in the second team, which doesn't know how." That man was an educator, and not a hired winner of games.

College sports must be maintained chiefly for those who do not know how to play, and therefore do not know how to live.

From this point of view the minor sports may be of major importance. He must subject them all to the one great test: Do they teach men how to live, and how to live together in the service of the nation? Boxing—does it teach self-control to those who participate and those who look on, or does it diminish such control? Golf—does it cultivate isolation or co-operation? Tennis—is it merely a brilliant spectacle for a summer's day or a training in civic virtues? Water polo—is it a species of submarine warfare or a real development in honorable co-operative endeavor? It would indeed be a happy result of the war if some sports now called minor could come to the front because of their educational value, and some sports called major, because of their gate receipts, could be sent to the side lines until they bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

We want all business and all sport, all work and all play, relieved of superfluity and extravagance, stripped for action in the nation's service, and co-ordinated with the laboratory and the library and the class-room in the endless task of creating men fit to be citizens of America.

OUR REPLY TO GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

President Wilson's Address to the Congress,
February 11, 1918.

THE AUSTRO-GERMAN TERMS.

ON the eighth of January I had the honor of addressing you on the objects of the war as our people conceive them. The Prime Minister of Great Britain had spoken in similar terms on the fifth of January. To these addresses the German Chancellor replied on the twenty-fourth and Count Czernin, for Austria, on the same day. It is gratifying to have our desire so promptly realized that all exchanges of view on this great matter should be made in the hearing of all the world.

Count Czernin's reply, which is directed chiefly to my own address of the eighth of January, is uttered in a very friendly tone. He finds in my statement a sufficiently encouraging approach to the views of his own government to justify him in believing that it furnishes a basis for a more detailed discussion of purposes by the two governments. He is represented to have intimated that the views he was expressing had been communicated to me beforehand and that I was aware of them at the time he was uttering them; but in this I am sure he was misunderstood. I had received no intimation of what he intended to say. There was, of course, no reason why he should communicate privately with me. I am quite content to be one of his public audience.

Count von Hertling's reply is, I must say, very vague and very confusing. It is full of equivocal phrases and

leads it is not clear where. But it is certainly in a very different tone from that of Count Czernin, and apparently of an opposite purpose. It confirms, I am sorry to say, rather than removes, the unfortunate impression made by what we had learned of the conferences at Brest-Litovsk. His discussion and acceptance of our general principles lead him to no practical conclusions. He refuses to apply them to the substantive items which must constitute the body of any final settlement. He is jealous of international action and of international counsel. He accepts, he says, the principle of public diplomacy, but he appears to insist that it be confined, at any rate in this case, to generalities and that the several particular questions of territory and sovereignty, the several questions upon whose settlement must depend the acceptance of peace by the twenty-three States now engaged in the war, must be discussed and settled, not in general counsel, but severally by the nations most immediately concerned by interest or neighborhood. He agrees that the seas should be free, but looks askance at any limitation to that freedom by international action in the interest of the common order. He would without reserve be glad to see economic barriers removed between nation and nation, for that could in no way impede the ambitions of the military party with whom he seems constrained to keep on terms. Neither does he raise objection to a limitation of armaments. That matter will be settled of itself, he thinks, by the economic conditions which must follow the war. But the German colonies, he demands, must be returned without debate. He will discuss with no one but the representatives of Russia what disposition shall be made of the peoples and the lands of the Baltic provinces; with no one but the government of France the "conditions" under which French territory shall be evacuated; and only with Austria what shall be done with Poland. In the determination of all questions affecting the Balkan States he defers, as I understand him, to Austria and Turkey; and with regard to the agreements to be entered into concerning the non-Turkish peoples of the present Ottoman Empire, to the Turkish authorities themselves. After a settlement all around, effected in this fashion, by individual barter and concession, he would have no objection, if I correctly interpret his statement, to a league of nations which would undertake to hold the new balance of power steady against external disturbance.

WE DEMAND "A NEW INTERNATIONAL ORDER."

It must be evident to every one who understands what this war has wrought in the opinion and temper of the world that no general peace, no peace worth the infinite sacrifices of these years of tragical suffering, can possibly be arrived at in any such fashion. The method the German Chancellor proposes is the method of the Congress of Vienna. We cannot and will not return to that. What is at stake now is the peace of the world. What we are striving for is a new international order based upon broad and universal principles of right and justice—no mere peace of shreds and patches. Is it possible that Count von Hertling does not see that, does not grasp it, is in fact living in his thought in a world dead and gone? Has he utterly forgotten the Reichstag resolutions of the nineteenth of July, or does he deliberately ignore them? They spoke of the conditions of a